

be subsequently tested in the Agency's in-use emissions testing programs. The self-addressed postcard and owner telephone questionnaire are completed using information readily available to and given by owner of vehicles from a vehicle class under investigation for possible emissions noncompliance. The maintenance verification form is administered to representatives of repair facilities that performed maintenance on vehicles whose owners have responded to the owner telephone questionnaire. The main method of information collection is through telephone calls between vehicle or engine owners and EPA contractor or grantee staff. Respondents are not required to develop or maintain data records solely due to this information request since requested data comes from records vehicle or engine owners would keep as part of their personal or business records. Responses to these information requests are completely voluntary. Data received under this ICR is made available only to EPA and the automobile manufacturer whose engine class is being tested.

An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. The OMB control numbers for EPA's regulations are listed in 40 CFR part 9 and 48 CFR chapter 15.

The EPA would like to solicit comments to:

(i) evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;

(ii) evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

(iii) enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

(iv) minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

Burden Statement: EPA's burden estimates for this information collection are broken down according to the three different items in this collection, namely the postcard, telephone questionnaire, and the maintenance verification form. EPA estimates that the 15,000 people annually who receive a postcard will require six minutes to read and respond to it. The 2,100 people who will respond to administered telephone questionnaires, based on annual averages, will require one-half an hour on average to respond. Parties

responding to the postcards and telephone questionnaires will only do so once per year. Parties responding to the maintenance verification form, an estimated total of 50 repair facility personnel, will need approximately one-quarter hour to respond, and might be required to provide the requested information twice a year. Costs to respondents associated with this ICR are attributed to individual or staff time involved in responding to the information requests. The costs of responding to the postcard, the telephone questionnaire, and the maintenance verification form are \$2.00, \$10.00, and \$10.00, respectively. Burden means the total time, effort, or financial resources expended by persons to generate, maintain, retain, or disclose or provide information to or for a Federal agency. This includes the time needed to review instructions; develop, acquire, install, and utilize technology and systems for the purposes of collecting, validating, and verifying information, processing and maintaining information, and disclosing and providing information; adjust the existing ways to comply with any previously applicable instructions and requirements; train personnel to be able to respond to a collection of information; search data sources; complete and review the collection of information; and transmit or otherwise disclose the information.

Dated: November 9, 1995.

Donald Zinger,

Acting Director, Office of Mobile Sources.

[FR Doc. 95-29360 Filed 11-30-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

[ER-FRL-5230-9]

Environmental Impact Statements and Regulations; Availability of EPA Comments

Availability of EPA comments prepared November 13, 1995 Through November 17, 1995 pursuant to the Environmental Review Process (ERP), under Section 309 of the Clean Air Act and Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act as amended. Requests for copies of EPA comments can be directed to the Office of Federal Activities at (202) 260-5076.

An explanation of the ratings assigned to draft environmental impact statements (EISs) was published in FR dated April 14, 1995 (60 FR 19047).

Draft EISs

ERP No. D-AFS-D61044-PA Rating LO, Allegheny National Wild and Scenic River Management Plan,

Implementation, Allegheny National Forest, Venango, Warren and Forest Counties, PA.

SUMMARY: EPA expressed lack of objections to the Allegheny Wild and Scenic River Management Plan Draft EIS.

ERP No. D-AFS-J65242-MT Rating EC2, Checkerboard Land Exchange, Plan of Approval and Implementation, Kootenai, Lolo and Flathead National Forests, Lincoln, Flathead and Sanders Counties, MT.

SUMMARY: EPA expressed environmental concerns about potential adverse impacts to water quality and fisheries. EPA believed that specific modifications and mitigations to protect watersheds, water quality and fisheries should be presented in the FEIS which would demonstrate compliance with Montana's Water Quality Standards and Nondegradation Policy.

ERP No. D-AFS-K67031-NV Rating EO2, Dash Open Pit and Underground Mining Project, Implementation, Expanding existing Gold Mining Operations at the Jerritt Canyon Project, Plan of Operation Approval and COE Section 404 Permit, Humboldt Toiyabe National Forest, Independence Mountain Range, Elko County, NV.

SUMMARY: EPA expressed environmental objections to the proposed project's potential impacts to water quality from design and placement of waste rock dumps in drainages. The FEIS should address impacts to water quality, waste rock handling, waste rock dump design, mitigation measures, baseline water quality, alternatives to the proposed project, air quality impacts and cumulative impacts.

ERP No. D-BLM-J02009-00 Rating EC2, Express Crude Oil Pipeline Project, Construction, Operation and Maintenance, Issuance of Right-of-Way Grant, Hill, Chouteau, Fergus, Judith Basin, Wheatland, Golden Valley, Stillwater and Carbon Counties, MT and Bighorn, Washakies, Hot Springs, Fremont and Watrona Counties, WY.

SUMMARY: EPA expressed environmental concerns regarding the proposed pipeline crossings of rivers, streams and wetlands, and asked that additional information on the proposed leak detection systems and emergency spill response plans be provided. EPA requested that the final EIS include additional resource information to fully assess and mitigate environmental impacts.

ERP No. D-BLM-K67020-AZ Rating EO2, Cyprus Bagdad Copper Mine, Mill Tailings and Waste Rock Storage Expansion, Plan of Operation Approval,

NPDES and COE Section 404 Permits Issuance, Yavapai County, AZ.

SUMMARY: EPA expressed environmental objections based on the projects potential impacts to water quality and need for additional information in the final EIS on surface water, groundwater, geochemistry, monitoring, alternatives to the proposed action, facility design and hazardous materials management.

ERP No. D-FHW-E40762-AL Rating EC2, Montgomery Outer Loop Construction, US 80 southwest of Montgomery to I-85 east of Montgomery, Funding and COE Section 404 Permit Issuance, Montgomery County, AL.

SUMMARY: EPA expressed environmental concerns with all the proposed alternatives due to potential impacts to wetland and upland forest resources and the lack of detail contained in the proposed mitigation plan. EPA requested that additional information on these issues be provided in the final document.

ERP No. D-FHW-J40212-CO Rating LO, CO-82 Highway Transportation Project, Improvements to "Entrance to Aspen", Funding and COE Section 404 Permit, City of Aspen, Pitkin County, CO.

SUMMARY: EPA expressed lack of objections to the proposed action.

ERP No. D-FHW-K40214-CA Rating EC2, Alternatives to Replacement of the Embarcadero Freeway and the Terminal Separator Structure, (Formerly CA-480) Implementation, Permit Approvals and Funding, San Francisco County, CA.

SUMMARY: EPA raised environmental concerns over the cumulative impacts of the project, since there are several transportation development projects in the area, as well as environmental concerns with runoff, erosion and hazardous materials found in the soils at the project site.

ERP No. D-FRC-J05076-MT Rating LO, Kerr Hydroelectric Project (FERC No. 5-021), License Modification Issuance to Existing License, Flathead River, Flathead and Lake Counties, MT.

Summary: While EPA had no objection to the proposed action it did recommend that some clarification on shore stabilization and water flows be provided in the final EIS.

ERP No. D-NPS-G61035-NM Rating LO, Petroglyph National Monument, General Management Plan and Development Concept Plan, Implementation, Bernalillo County, NM.

Summary: EPA had no objections to the proposed action described in the DEIS.

Final EISs

ERP No. F-AFS-J65222-ND, Southern Little Missouri and Cedar River Oil and Gas Leasing, Approvals, Custer National Forest, Medora Ranger District, Cedar River National Grassland, Grant River Ranger District, Billings, Golden Valley, Slope, Grant and Sioux Counties, ND.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns about project impacts to air and water resources. EPA recommended a Conditions of Approval section be included in the document to describe development subsurface requirements for protecting water resources. EPA suggested that screening models be run with emissions calculated for the EIS, to evaluate potential impacts to air quality and visibility.

ERP No. F-AFS-J65228-UT, Jacob/Swale Vegetation Management Project, Implementation, Dixie National Forest, Escalante Ranger District, Garfield County, UT.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns over wildlife habitat and potential adverse impacts from road management practices to elk and deer and the Northern Goshawk.

ERP No. F-BLM-J03022-WY, Greater Wamsutter Area II Natural Gas Development Project, Approvals and Permits Issuance, Carbon and Sweetwater Counties, WY.

Summary: EPA continued to express environmental concerns about cumulative effects of the anticipated intensive development through out southwest Wyoming.

ERP No. F-BOP-G81008-LA, Pollock US Penitentiary and Federal Prison Camp (FPC), Construction and Operation and Site Selection of a former World War II Military Installation, Grant Parish, LA.

Summary: EPA's previous environmental concerns have been addressed, therefore EPA has no objection to the proposed action.

ERP No. F-FAA-C51013-NJ, Expanded East Coast Plan, Changes in Aircraft Flight Patterns over the State of New Jersey, Implementation, NJ.

Summary: EPA believed that the proposed project, including the Solberg Mitigation Proposal, will not result in significant adverse environmental impacts; therefore, EPA has no objection to its implementation.

ERP No. F-FHW-E40728-AL, I-59/I-759 Interchange to US 11 and US 431/US 278, Construction, Funding, Etowah County, AL.

Summary: EPA's review found that the proposed alternative would have no major impacts on the natural

environment provided Best Management Practices and mitigation are utilized.

ERP No. F-GSA-K80036-CA, Fresno—United States Courthouse, Site Selection and Construction, City of Fresno, Fresno County, CA.

Summary: Review of the Final EIS was not deemed necessary. No formal comment letter was sent to the preparing agency.

ERP No. F-NOA-C91002-PR, U. S. Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico Corals and Reef Associated Plants and Invertebrates Fishery Management Plan, Implementation and NPDES Permit, PR and VI.

Summary: EPA believed that the proposed project will not result in significant adverse environmental impacts; therefore, EPA had no objection to its implementation.

Regulations

ERP No. R-NRC-A06177-00, 10 CFR Parts 60, 72, 73 and 75—Safeguards for Spent Nuclear Fuel or High-Level Radioactive Waste RIN-3150-AF32.

Summary: EPA had no comments to the proposed rule.

Dated: November 28, 1995.

William D. Dickerson,

Director, NEPA Compliance Division, Office of Federal Activities.

[FR Doc. 95-29335 Filed 11-30-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

[ER-FRL-5230-8]

Environmental Impact Statements; Notice of Availability

Responsible Agency: Office of Federal Activities, General Information (202) 260-5076 OR (202) 260-5075. Weekly receipt of Environmental Impact Statements Filed November 20, 1995 Through November 24, 1995 Pursuant to 40 CFR 1506.9.

EIS No. 950546, Draft EIS, AFS, OR, Foss Perkins Analysis Area, Vegetation Management and Timber Sale, Ochoco National Forest, Snow Mountain Ranger District, Harney County, OR, Due: January 16, 1996, Contact: Bill Rice (541) 573-7292.

EIS No. 950547, Draft EIS, FHW, UT, Norman H. Bangerter Highway (Previously Known as the West Valley Highway) 12600 South Street to I-15, Funding and COE Section 404 Permit, in the Cities of Bluffdale, Riverton and Draper, Salt Lake County, UT, Due: January 16, 1996, Contact: Tom Allen (801) 963-0184.

EIS No. 950548, Draft EIS, FRC, MI, WI, Menominee River Basin Multiple Project, Application for New Licenses